



1
2
3 PLEASANT GROVE CITY
4 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
5 June 25, 2015
6

7 **PRESENT:** Chair Drew Armstrong, Commissioners Scott Richards, Lisa Coombs, Amy Cardon
8 and Jennifer Baptista
9

10 **STAFF:** City Planner Royce Davies, Planning Tech Barbara Johnson, City Engineer Degen
11 Lewis and NAB Chairperson Libby Flegal
12

13 Vice Chair Levi Adams and Commissioners Dallin Nelson and Peter Steele were excused. Chair
14 Armstrong stated that Commissioner Baptista would be a voting member at the meeting. He also
15 confirmed that Gary Yeates resigned from the Planning Commission.
16

17 The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.
18

19 **Commission Business:**
20

- 21 • **Pledge of Allegiance:** Commissioner Baptista led the Pledge of Allegiance.
22
23 • **Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Richards gave the opening remarks.
24

25 Chair Armstrong stated that a few corrections needed to be made to the agenda. Items 1 and 12
26 were to be continued to the July 9, 2015 meeting.
27

28 • **Agenda Approval:**
29

- 30 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved to approve the written agenda
31 as public record, with the continuation of Items 1 and 12 to July 9, 2015.
32 Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners
33 unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
34

35 • **Staff Reports:**
36

- 37 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved to approve the Staff Reports
38 as part of the public record. Commissioner Baptista seconded the motion.
39 The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
40

- **Declaration of conflicts and abstentions from Commission Members:** There were none.

ITEM 1 – Public Hearing to consider an eight-lot subdivision called Honeysuckle Estates being approximately 0.66 acres comprising two lots located within Pleasant Grove City on property located at approximately 975 South Locust Avenue in the R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone. **SCRATCH GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOOD.** **Continued from the June 11 Planning Commission Meeting. Continued to July 9, 2015.*

ITEM 3 – Public Hearing to consider the request of Steve Lindsay for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a fence exceeding six feet in height on property located at approximately 1892 North 180 West in the R1-20 (Single Family Residential) Zone. **NORTH FIELD NEIGHBORHOOD.**

City Planner Royce Davies presented the staff report and aerial photographs of the property. He identified areas where an eight-foot fence had already been constructed on the subject property. Mr. Davies informed the Commission that the applicant assumed that he was allowed to have an eight-foot fence under the current Conditional Use Permit for his pool, which was the main reason behind the desire for more privacy. The Code allows for a fence of up to 10 feet with a Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Davies stated that the proposed fence will not have a significant visual impact on the neighbors and staff recommended approval.

The applicant, Steve Lindsay, gave his address as 1892 North 180 West and assured the Commission that he spoke to all of the surrounding neighbors prior to construction. All were supportive of the eight-foot fence height.

Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Coombs moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the proposed Steve Lindsay Conditional Use Permit request for an eight-foot fence in the rear and side yard of property at 1892 North 180 West, in R1-20 (Single Family Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. The Commissioners voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

ITEM 4 – Public Hearing to consider a Site Plan approval for two buildings comprising Majestic Meadows Phase 6 on approximately 1.9 acres on property located at approximately 220 South State Street in the C-G (General Commercial) Zone. **SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD.**

Mr. Davies presented the staff report regarding the Majestic Meadows project, part of which has already been constructed. He explained that the application is a request for site plan approval of Buildings J and K. Mr. Davies stated that building J will be approximately 8,000 square feet in size, while building K will be 14,640 square feet. He remarked that the project has already brought significant commercial businesses to the area, which the General Plan supports. Mr. Davies identified the different types of space the developer intends to build, which will attract a

1 variety of businesses to the area. Upon review from staff, they discovered minor issues
2 regarding landscaping and parking. Mr. Davies confirmed that these issues were brought to the
3 attention of the applicant and should not have an effect on the Planning Commission's decision.
4 Staff recommended approval.

5
6 Commissioner Richards asked if the issues identified need to be included in the motion.
7 Mr. Davies responded that they did not since they are related to the final review process. He
8 stated that the issues primarily pertained to the addition of trees and screening parking from the
9 street.

10
11 The applicant, Ken Berg, was present on behalf of Berg Civil Engineering in Highland. He had
12 no information to add to the presentation but confirmed that he was available to answer
13 questions.

14
15 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
16 closed the public hearing.

17
18 Commissioner Richards asked the applicant if they had received commitments for potential
19 businesses, and what type of businesses they were. Mr. Berg stated that they had several
20 businesses interested in Building K for retail warehouse units. There had also been some
21 discussion of office spaces and a possible reception center for Building J.

22
23 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission recommend
24 APPROVAL of the proposed Site Plan for Majestic Meadows Phase 6 located at approximately
25 220 South State Street, in the General Commercial Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and
26 findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the following condition:

- 27
28 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

29
30 Commissioner Cardon seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
31 The motion carried.

32
33 **ITEM 5 – Public Hearing to consider a two-lot subdivision called Bella Grace on Property**
34 **located at approximately 24 East 100 North in the Downtown Village Zone, Mixed Use Overlay.**
35 **OLD FORT NEIGHBORHOOD.**

36
37 Mr. Davies presented the staff report and displayed aerial photographs of the property. He noted
38 that the property has not yet been acquired by the developer but will be within a few days.
39 Mr. Davies stated that the developer is proposing that Lot 1 contain live-work units and Lot 2
40 contain regular townhome units. Both lots meet the minimum requirements of the zone
41 including parking. Staff recommended approval based on their analysis of the application.

42
43 The applicant, Steve Allred, gave his address as 37 East 1200 North and commented that the
44 group that is purchasing the property wants to split up the commercial from the residential rather
45 than combine them. He also stated that there are easements that run from Lot 2 to Lot 1 but he
46 did not indicate that there were any issues with them.

1 Commissioner Richards commented that they reviewed the application quite thoroughly a few
2 months ago. Originally the proposal was for commercial units on the bottom floor with
3 residential above. Commissioner Richards asked the applicant to clarify the new plan. Mr.
4 Allred stated that Lot 1 would be the same as proposed before, while Lot 2 would only contain
5 townhomes.

6
7 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
8 closed the public hearing.

9
10 **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
11 proposed two-lot preliminary subdivision called Bella Grace Plat A located at approximately 100
12 North Main Street, in the Downtown Village Zone, Commercial Sales Subdistrict, Mixed Use
13 Overlay; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as
14 modified by the following condition:

- 15
16 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

17
18 Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
19 The motion carried.

20
21 **ITEM 6 – Public Hearing to consider a one-lot subdivision called Crystal View Estates on**
22 **property located at approximately 1268 Crystal View Drive in the R1-20 (Single Family**
23 **Residential) Zone. GROVE CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD.**

24
25 It was noted that the above item had not been continued as indicated on the agenda, however, the
26 public hearing would proceed as scheduled. Mr. Davies presented the staff report and stated that
27 the subdivision was the result of 1350 East being moved. He presented aerial photographs of the
28 area and explained that essentially, it is a boundary line adjustment, but City Code requires it go
29 through the approval process again because it is part of an existing subdivision. Mr. Davies
30 explained that the lot is 12,600 square feet in size, while the minimum lot size for the R1-20 zone
31 is 20,000 square feet. The site plan was approved in 1978 when the minimum lot requirement
32 was 9,000 square feet. As a result, the subdivision would actually be adding to the square
33 footage. Staff determined that it is a legal non-conforming lot and doesn't affect approval of the
34 new subdivision. Mr. Davies indicated that the lot meets all other requirements of the zone.
35 Staff recommended approval. It was noted that the applicant was not present.

36
37 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
38 closed the public hearing.

39
40 **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
41 proposed one-lot preliminary subdivision called Crystal View Estates located at approximately
42 1268 Crystal View Drive in the R1-20 (Single Family Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits,
43 conditions, and findings contained in the staff report; and as modified by the following
44 condition:

- 45
46 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

1 Commissioner Baptista seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
2 The motion carried.
3

4 **ITEM 7** – Public Hearing to consider a 76-lot subdivision called Strawberry Creek Villas Plat A
5 Amended on property located at approximately 840 West 2200 South in The Grove Zone, Mixed
6 Housing Subdistrict, Senior Housing Overlay. **SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD**,
7

8 Mr. Davies prefaced his presentation by stating that the Commission had already seen the
9 application but it was back as a result of a modification. Originally, a spring was discovered on
10 the northwest side of the property and the applicant was required to resolve the situation with the
11 Army Corps of Engineers. Since then, the applicant has been allotted area there and would like
12 to adjust the property to allow for 76 lots instead of the approved 75. Mr. Davies presented the
13 new map and indicated that Lot 76 was split from Lot 62. The plan was determined to meet the
14 requirements of the zone. Staff recommended approval.
15

16 The applicant, Dave Erikson, gave his address as 791 North 100 East in Lehi. He gave an
17 explanation of the situation and stated that they had always intended to have 76 homes on the
18 property but discovered the wetland issues right before submitting preliminary plat approval.
19 Not knowing how long it would take to work through the Army Corps of Engineers, the
20 applicant submitted the plat with 75 homes with the intent to modify it once the issue was
21 resolved. Mr. Erikson confirmed that the density would not be heavily affected by the addition,
22 keeping them well below the maximum density of eight units per acres.
23

24 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
25 closed the public hearing.
26

27 **MOTION:** Commissioner Cardon moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
28 proposed 76-lot preliminary subdivision called Strawberry Creek Villas Plat A Amended located
29 at approximately 840 West 220 South in The Grove Mixed Housing Subdistrict, Senior Housing
30 Overlay; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report.
31 Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
32 The motion carried.
33

34 **ITEM 8** - Public Hearing to consider a 2.22-acre Site Plan approval for development called
35 Grove Creek II on property located at approximately 2168 West Grove Parkway in The Grove
36 Zone, Interchange Subdistrict. **SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD**.
37

38 Mr. Davies presented the staff report regarding the application for site plan approval for the
39 Grove Creek development. He indicated that the development was approved several years ago
40 but the approval expired. Mr. Davies stated that the application did not contain any significant
41 changes from the original proposal and indicated that the buildings will be standard office
42 buildings. The needed modifications pertained to the specific zone requirements including
43 bicycle parking and landscaping requirements. Staff recommended approval.
44

1 The applicant, Taylor Jackson, was present on behalf of Nearon Enterprises in Walnut Creek,
2 California. Mr. Jackson stated that they attempted to lease the property but have been unable to
3 do so in two years. Their intention at this point is to build.

4
5 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
6 closed the public hearing.

7
8 In response to a question from Commissioner Richards, it was confirmed that the original
9 approval was granted in 2012.

10
11 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City
12 Council APPROVE the Grove Creek 2 Commercial Site Plan, and adopt the exhibits, conditions,
13 and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the following condition:

- 14
15 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

16
17 Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
18 The motion carried.

19
20 **ITEM 9 – Public Hearing to consider a five- lot subdivision approval called Grove Creek Center**
21 **Commercial on property located at approximately 2168 West Grove Parkway in The Grove**
22 **Zone, Interchange Subdistrict. SAM WHITE'S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD.**

23
24 Mr. Davies presented the staff report and stated that this item also had previous approval, in
25 relation to Item 8. He presented aerial photographs and identified the five lots, which will be
26 broken down into different building pad areas. Mr. Davies stated that the applicant also made
27 minor adjustments since the original approval but the changes meet the Code requirements. Staff
28 recommended approval.

29
30 In response to a question from Chair Armstrong, Mr. Jackson confirmed that Nearon Enterprises
31 owns three of the lots, while the others are possibly owned by Dennis Baker. It was noted that
32 the applicant was not present.

33
34 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
35 closed the public hearing.

36
37 **MOTION:** Commissioner Coombs moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
38 proposed five-lot preliminary subdivision called Grove Creek Center Commercial located at
39 approximately 2168 West Grove Parkway, in The Grove Interchange Subdistrict; and adopt the
40 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the following
41 condition:

- 42
43 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

44
45 Commissioner Baptista seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
46 The motion carried.

1 **ITEM 10** – Public Hearing concerning proposed text amendments to the Pleasant Grove City
2 Code, Section 10-11E-2, Yard Requirements in the Downtown Village Zone, regarding historic
3 buildings and single-family lots. **OLD FORT NEIGHBORHOOD.**
4

5 Mr. Davies provided background information regarding this section of the Code and stated that
6 in the Downtown Village Zone the City has primarily focused on commercial development
7 rather than residential. They have lately been faced with questions regarding residential
8 development. The proposed text amendments all relate to requirements for residential
9 development in the zone. Mr. Davies indicated that developments along Main Street are required
10 to be built right up to the property line, against the front sidewalk. Their intention is to create a
11 streetscape. In other areas of the zone they are proposing setback requirements of 20 feet front
12 and rear yards, as well as a 20-foot street side setback for corner lots. The interior side setbacks
13 would be eight feet. Mr. Davies stated that these are standard setback measurements, although
14 smaller than most R1 zones.
15

16 There was discussion regarding the Bella Grace development that was approved earlier in the
17 meeting, and its proposed setbacks. Mr. Davies confirmed that Bella Grace would be held to the
18 standards in place at the time of approval. As a result, approval of the proposed text amendment
19 would not affect it.
20

21 Commission Richards also addressed accessory buildings allowed in the zone. Mr. Davies stated
22 that they were using the standard R1 requirements which are not written in this section of the
23 Code.
24

25 Mr. Davies stated that previously buildings adjacent to historic buildings were limited in height.
26 For instance, if a historic building is one story, the adjacent buildings can only be built up to two
27 stories. Mr. Davies stated that this was also to be changed to allow development of up to three
28 stories with design requirements. Mr. Davies confirmed that the proposed changes were
29 motivated by a potential project coming into the area.
30

31 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
32 closed the public hearing.
33

34 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City
35 Council APPROVE the proposed text amendment to modify yard requirements in Section 10-
36 11E-2-7 of the Downtown Village Chapter of the City Code, in the Pleasant Grove City Code;
37 and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner
38 Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion
39 carried.
40

41 **ITEM 11** – Public Hearing concerning proposed text amendments to the Pleasant Grove City
42 Code, Section 10-15-36-D, Commercial Communities applicable City Wide, reducing required
43 1000 foot distance between cell towers. **CITY WIDE.**
44

45 Mr. Davies stated that there were two parts to the proposed text amendment. The first would
46 reduce the currently required 1,000-foot separation between cell towers to 150 feet. Mr. Davies

1 explained that they based this number on the fact that the cell towers are already required to be
2 150 feet from the nearest residential property. Staff felt this distance would allow cell towers to
3 cluster together. Mr. Davies indicated that the amendment was the result of an issue with
4 Verizon Wireless, their application to construct a cell tower on school property, and issues with
5 Sprint Wireless and their attempt to collocate on the tower in Manila Park.
6

7 The second part of the amendment pertained to collocating. Currently, all newly constructed
8 towers are required to provide two options for collocation, however, there is no way to enforce
9 collocation when it is requested. Mr. Davies stated that the amendment would add language
10 requiring companies to allow collocation on their cell towers when the City requests it. If they
11 choose not to comply, the conditional use permit would be up for review and could potentially be
12 terminated. Mr. Davies commented that he had been working with the representative from
13 Verizon Wireless, and he sent a copy of the proposed amendment to him for review by their
14 attorney. They requested a language change due to unclear sentence structure. Mr. Davies
15 recommended a condition be added to the motion requesting that he and the City Attorney work
16 to clarify the wording of the amendment.
17

18 Commissioner Richards asked how they could prevent the area from becoming overloaded with
19 cell towers. Mr. Davies responded that they could restrict the amendment to City property only
20 meaning that the 150 foot distance would only be allowed on property owned by the City of
21 Pleasant Grove. The 1,000 foot distance would be required everywhere else in the city. Mr.
22 Davies confirmed that they would only be able to require collocation on towers located on City
23 property. The City Attorney had reviewed the proposed amendment and was comfortable with
24 it.
25

26 Chair Armstrong suggested that the 150-foot distance be allowed on all public property rather
27 than just City property. There was continued discussion regarding the proposed distance and
28 how many towers would be constructed in an area like Manila Park.
29

30 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
31 closed the public hearing.
32

33 Before making a motion, Commissioner Baptista requested more information regarding the
34 rights attached to school property. Mr. Davies suggested that be included in the motion.
35

36 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista recommended the Planning Commission CONTINUE the
37 review of the proposed text amendment to modify cell tower requirements in Section 10-15-36-D
38 of the Supplementary Development Standards Chapter of the City Code, in the Pleasant Grove
39 City Code, until July 9, 2015, based on the following findings:
40

- 41 1. A recommendation that staff modify the verbiage requiring a response within 30 days.
- 42
- 43 2. A recommendation that staff consult with the City Attorney on the effects of broadening
44 the request to all public properties.
45

Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
The motion carried.

ITEM 12 – Public Hearing to consider a one-lot subdivision called Creekside North being approximately 5.75 acres on property located at approximately 544 West 3300 North in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone. **Continued to July 9, 2015.*

ITEM 13 – Discussion and recommendation regarding accessory apartments regulations issues.
The possibility of conducting a special meeting to discuss the above matter was discussed.

MOTION: Commissioner Richards moved that the Planning Commission CONTINUE the discussion regarding accessory apartments regulation issues to a future meeting, yet to be determined, so that more Commissioners could be present for the discussion. Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

**Review and approve the Minutes and Report of Actions from the following meetings:
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for June 11, 2015.**

MOTION: Commissioner Baptista moved to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of June 11, 2015. Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

**Review and approve the Minutes from the following meeting: Joint City Council and
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for March 24, 2015.**

MOTION: Commissioner Baptista moved to approve the Joint City Council and Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of March 24, 2015. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

Business – it was noted that Commissioner Coombs will not be present for the July 9 meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Richards moved to adjourn. Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Planning Commission Chair

Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech

Date Approved